APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/509,055	03/20/2000	HANS-DIETER HECKER	P00.0069	7794

29177 7590 08/25/2004	EXAMINER
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLC P. O. BOX 1135 CHICAGO, IL 60690-1135	GAUTHIER, GERALD

	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2645	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 June 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *9 and 12-18* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *9 and 12-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   **Claims 9, 12, 14, and 16-18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Eslambolchi et al. (US 5,875,422) in view of Moughanni et al. (US

5,675,817).

Regarding **claim 9**, Eslambolchi discloses a method in a communication system

(10 on FIG. 1) for translating messages that are directed to a called subscriber (14 on

FIG. 1) into a language that is dependent upon the called subscriber (column 1, lines 7-

10), the method comprising the steps of:

storing selector information (column 3, line 16 "enter a language preference")

designating a language that is allocated to a relevant subscriber (12 on FIG. 1) for

internal subscribers in the communication system (column 3, lines 14-26) [The front end

processor prompts the calling party to choose a language of preference for the speech

of the called party];

storing display texts (column 3, line 15 "prompts"), in the communication system,

for a dialogue operator interface (26 on FIG. 1) of internal terminal devices (10 on FIG.

1) in several languages (column 3, lines 14-26) [The front end processor provides the

calling party with an announcement to choose among several languages];

forming the selector information dependent on the language of the display text for

the dialogue operator interface that is selected by a subscriber (column 3, lines 14-26)

[The switch launches a call to the called party based on the language chosen by the

calling party].

Eslambolchi discloses the calling party invoking a translation of the

communication but fails to disclose the translation being done automatically based on a

predetermined selection.

However, Moughanni teaches comparing the selector information of a calling

subscriber (column 3, line 3 "detects a language of the incoming message"), when a

connection is set up, to the selector information of the called subscriber (column 3, lines

1-10) [The data processing system 20 detects the language of the incoming message to

determine if the language is different than the default language of the user]; and

automatically activating a loop-in function (column 5, line 47 "the CPU 28 fetches

the translation look-up program"), when items of the selector information of the calling

subscriber differs from the selector information in the called subscriber, which effects an

insertion of a translator (Look-up table 30 on FIG. 1) into the connection (column 5, lines

44-55) [The CPU 28 fetches the translation look-up program to translate the input

language to the preferred language using the look-up table 30].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eslambolchi using the automatic translation as taught by Moughanni.

This modification of the invention would allow the system to automatically trans late the communications if the called party language were different so that the called party would gain access to critical international paging messages.

Regarding **claim 12**, Eslambolchi discloses transmitting, when a calling terminal device and a called terminal device are allocated to different communication systems, the selector information from the communication system of the calling terminal device to the communication system of the called terminal device (column 4, lines 38-55).

Regarding **claim 14**, Eslambolchi discloses transmitting, in cases when a calling terminal device and a called terminal device are allocated to different communication systems, the selector information from the communication system of the called terminal device to the communication system of the calling terminal device (column 4, lines 38-55).

Regarding **claim 16**, Eslambolchi discloses deactivating the loop-in function (column 4, lines 1-10).

Regarding **claim 17**, Eslambolchi discloses wherein the message to be

translated is at least one of a voice message, a fax message, a video message and a

message for electronic mail (column 4, lines 56-65).

Regarding **claim 18**, Eslambolchi discloses a system in a communication system

for translating messages, that are directed to a called subscriber, into a language that

depends on the called subscriber (column 1, lines 7-10), the system comprising:

a text memory (26 on FIG. 1) in which display text for a display operator interface

of internal terminal devices (12' on FIG. 1) are stored in several languages (column 4,

lines 38-55) [The calling party is prompt to choose the preferred language in options

display on the computer];

subscriber-specific storage elements (26 on FIG. 1) in which an item of selector

information (column 3, line 16 "to enter a language translation preference") that

identifies a language (column 3, line 20 "one for English") that has been selected for the

subscriber terminal is respectively stored (column 3, lines 14-26) [The switch launches a

call to the called party based on the language chosen by the calling party];

at least one translator (28 on FIG. 1) for translating at least one of spoken

language and text (column 3, lines 41-51) [The front end processors translate the

speech received from both parties].

Eslambolchi discloses the calling party invoking a translation of the

communication but fails to disclose the translation being done automatically based on a

predetermined selection.

However, Moughanni teaches a control unit (CPU 28 on FIG. 1) for controlling a loop-in function (column 5, line 47 "the CPU 28 fetches the translation look-up program") that effectuates an insertion of a translator into a connection between the called subscriber and a calling subscriber in cases when the selector information allocated to the called subscriber is different from the selector information allocated to the calling subscriber (column 5, lines 44-55) [The CPU 28 fetches the translation look-up program to translate the input language to the preferred language using the look-up table 30 when the input language is different than the preferred language].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eslambolchi using the automatic translation as taught by Moughanni.

This modification of the invention would allow the system to automatically trans late the communications if the called party language were different so that the called party would gain access to critical international paging messages.

3.   **Claims 13 and 15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eslambolchi in view of Moughanni and in further view of Shaffer et al. (US 6,240,170).

Regarding **claims 13 and 15**, Eslambolchi as applied to **claims 12 and 14** differs from **claims 13 and 15**, in that it fails to disclose an ISDN call signaling.

However, Shaffer teaches transmitting the selector information in the framework

of an ISDN call signaling (column 2, lines 29-49).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to use an ISDN call signaling of Shaffer in the invention of Fung.

The modification of the invention would offer the capability of an ISDN call

signaling such as the system would improve the ability of voice processing systems to

handle various languages.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 9 and 12-18** have been considered

but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Marschner et al. is cited for a real-time administration-translation arrangement

(FIG. 1).

Kuno et al. is cited for an apparatus for automated natural language translation

(FIG. 1).

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gerald Gauthier whose telephone number is (703) 305-0981. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (703) 305-4895. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GERALD GAUTHIER
PATENT EXAMINER
g.g.
August 23, 2004

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600